

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-52, , objected to claims 23-52, and rejected claims 35-52. This paper amends the claims in respect to the objections and in respect to the rejections under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-52 remain in the application.

Objections to the claims

At section 1 of the Office action, claims 23-52 are objected to for various informalities. With this paper, the informalities noted in the Office action are attended to in a way believed sufficient to overcome the grounds for the objections raised in the Office action. (The Office action indicated that the word "apparatus" in claim 23 should be replaced by "method." Applicant respectfully points out that claim 23 is to a system, and believes the Examiner intended to indicate that "apparatus" should be replaced by "system," which is done in this paper.)

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

At section 3 of the Office action, claims 35-52 are rejected under 3 USC section 112, second paragraph. Of these, claims 35, 41 and 47 are independent and the others of these all depend from one or another of claims 35, 41 and 47. The Office action notes that claims 35, 41 and 47 each recite "the coherent process including a process in which consecutive data signal points are summed after (possibly) begin multiplied by respective factors," and the Office action states that it is unclear how consecutive data signal points can be summed when the signal has been data-wiped. With this paper, the objected to language in claims 35, 41 and 47 is replaced by, "either consecutive signal samples are summed or consecutive signal samples are summed after being multiplied by respective factors," and so "data points" is replaced by "samples," which replacement is supported in the application at the last line of

page 24 and the first line of page 25. (Note that at page 1, of the application, it is explained that, "the signal that is transmitted includes a data component, a PRN component, and a (sinusoidal) carrier component," and so after the data wipeoff, the PRN component persists, and it is that which is sampled.)

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Retter, Reg. No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Oct. 14, 2004

Date
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224